

COMMENT ON PROPOSED NEW TYPE FIXATIONS FOR *CRIOCERIS*
MÜLLER AND *LEMA* FABRICIUS. Z.N.(S.) 1786
(see volume 24, pages 116–118)

By R. A. Crowson (Zoology Department, University of Glasgow, Scotland)

The proposals by Selman and Smith for action by the Commission under plenary powers to fix types for the genera *Crioceris* Müller and *Lilioceris* Reitter seem to me to be eminently reasonable and constructive, and likely to lead to the retention of these names in the sense in which they have generally been used. In the case of *Lema* Fabricius, however, I fear that the position is rather more complicated. The species which Selman and Smith propose to establish as type of the genus, *Chrysomela cyanella* Linnaeus, is one which has been subject to a good deal of misidentification in the past. As far as I remember, there is a single specimen standing over this name in the Linnaean collection in London, which is one of the grass-eating species and probably identical with that described as *Lema lichenis* Voet. In the Fabricius-determined Hunterian collection in the University of Glasgow, the specimen standing over this name is a quite different species, that later named as *Lema puncticollis* Curtis, which feeds on thistles. In other Fabricius-determined collections, both *lichenis* and *puncticollis* were placed over the name *cyaneella* L., and it seems that the two species may have been regarded as opposite sexes of one. Jacoby, who first cited *cyaneella* L. as the type of *Lema*, synonymized the name with *puncticollis* Curtis and treated *lichenis* as a separate species, as could be seen in the British Museum collection arranged by him.

It is not made clear in the paper of Selman and Smith which species they actually regard as the true *cyaneella* L.; if it is *lichenis* Voet., then *Lema* will come to denote the grass-eating group for which Heinze proposed the new genus *Hapsidolema*, and for which Chuje and Kimote have more recently resurrected Des Gozis' name *Oulema*. If it is desired to retain a taxon corresponding to the main mass of *Lema*, excluding the relatively small grass-eating group, then this taxon will presumably have to be called *Petauristes* Latreille. This seems to me to be an undesirable change, which could be avoided by dropping *cyaneella* as the type of *Lema* in favour of an unambiguous Fabrician species, of which a very suitable one would be *L. cyanea* Fabricius. It seems to me that such a type designation would involve minimal changes in previous usage.

COMMENT ON *VOLUTA MITRA*. Z.N.(S.) 1728
(see volume 22, pages 355–356)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

There is a third alternative not presented by Coan. One could apply the Rules and adopt *Voluta mitra*, with *episcopalis* as a junior synonym.

Linnaeus consistently used one type face (roman) for species and another (italics) for varieties, which he sometimes named. It is evident that Linnaeus considered *mitra* the specific name, with two named varieties, *episcopalis* and *papalis*. The numbering of *episcopalis* instead of *mitra* was undoubtedly an error, corrected in the 12th edition.

If one considers it merely an error, corrected in a later edition, the valid specific name is *mitra*. Under the well-established principle that the name of the higher taxon takes precedence over the names of its subsidiary taxa, then *mitra* is the name of choice over *episcopalis* and *papalis*. Furthermore, this is clearly the intent of Linnaeus in 1764 and 1767. In 1764 (*Mus. Ulricae*: 597), Linnaeus described *Voluta mitra*, cited for it "Syst. Nat. 10, p. 732, n. 368" [the number associated with *episcopalis* in 1758], and listed under it three of the five references given under *episcopalis* in 1758. The usage of Dautzenberg and Bouge (1922) and of Dodge (1955) agrees with that of Linnaeus.

I believe that the treatment of this case should remain consistent with the Code, and that *mitra* Linnaeus should be adopted as the valid name of the species in preference to *episcopalis*. I note also that this would make no difference whatever in the recognition of the genus *Mitra*. The valid name of the type-species would become *Mitra mitra* (Linnaeus.)

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED ADDITION OF *PHELSUMA ORNATUM*
GRAY, 1825 TO THE OFFICIAL INDEX. Z.N.(S.) 1752
(see volume 23, pages 176-177)

The nomenclature committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists unanimously opposes this application.

It appears untoward for an author to request the suppression of a valid specific name, with an extant holotype, in favour of his own recently published junior synonym, especially when the holotype of the senior taxon was continually accessible in one of the world's largest collections.

It is axiomatic that even the most capable zoologist occasionally makes a mistake. Such a mistake is not to be interred by exercise of the plenary powers of the Commission unless application of the provisions of the Code would disturb stability or universality or cause confusion (Art. 79). This petition demonstrates neither disturbance nor confusion, but at most embarrassment of the petitioner.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *HIPPOCAMPUS*
ERECTUS PERRY, 1810. Z.N.(S.) 1753
(see volume 23, page 178)

The nomenclature committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists opposes this application.

Ginsburg 1937, (*Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* 83 : 566), commenting that Perry's description of *Hippocampus erectus* agreed best with that of *Hippocampus punctulatus* Guichenot, noted that it agreed fairly well with that of *Hippocampus hudsonius* De Kay, but possibly represented some other form such as *Hippocampus kincaidi* Townsend and Barbour. Ginsburg concluded that "there is no means now of determining with absolute certainty what *erectus* actually represents." Briggs, 1958 (*Bull. Florida State Mus.* 2(8) : 167) used the name *erectus* in place of *punctulatus*. Therefore, if the name *erectus* is to be suppressed, it would seem that such suppression should be in favor of *punctulatus* rather than *hudsonius*.

Thus, this application requests the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to rule, not on a question of nomenclature, but on a question of taxonomy: the identification of a certain fish from a published description and figure. This the Commission may not properly do. As is stated in the Preamble of the Code (1964 : 3), "... none [of the provisions of the Code] restricts the freedom of taxonomic thought or action."

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *CELLIA ERRABUNDUS*
SWELLENGREBEL, 1925. Z.N.(S.) 1760
(see volume 23, pages 190-192)

By John E. Scanlon (*Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

I have been engaged in a study of the genus *Anopheles* in south-east Asia for approximately four years and agree with the zoological conclusions of the applicants, namely: 1. that *errabundus* Swellengrebel is not related to *Anopheles philippinensis*; 2. that *errabundus* is not part of the Oriental fauna; 3. that *errabundus* is a senior synonym of *Anopheles darlingi* Root, 1926.